Cross-li
PURDUE UNIVERSITY:
 Clear speech production involves both language-universal specific strategies. Language-specific strategies are potentially subject the linguistic influence. An example of language-specific clear speech strategies: A laryngeal contrasts in stops. In English: the distinction between voiceless and voi enhanced via an asymmetrical VOT lengthening of voi (e.g., Picheny et al., 1986) In Korean: a distinctive acoustic cue is enhanced dep specific binary contrast (Kang & Guion, 2006). Aspirated-lenis contrast: onset F0 Aspirated-fortis and lenis-fortis contrasts: onset F0 and Relatively little is known to date about bilingual clear speed languages (cf. Granlund et al., 2012). To what extent do Korean-English bilinguals maintain lang clear speech strategies in each of the two languages they is their clear speech subject to cross-lingui For example, would their English clear speech be realized
manner and vice versa?
 Participants 30 Korean-English bilinguals residing in the US (20M 29.73, age SD = 3.48) 20 Midwestern American English monolinguals (4M, 24.95, age SD = 9.30) 20 Korean monolinguals residing in South Korea (8N 27.40, age SD = 5.52) Stimuli 6 English minimal pairs differing in voicing of word-instops: e.g., tab vs. dab 6 Korean minimal/near-minimal triplets that differ instates of word-initial stops: e.g., than.tha.ta (탄탄하다; lenis) vs. t*ar (딴딴하다; fortis) Procedure Participants read each target word one by one in iso Casual speaking style preceded clear speaking style. Each target word appeared three times within each
 VOT of word-initial stops (in ms) Onset f0 (normalized in semitones; Dmitrieva et al., Analyses A linear mixed effect model (<i>lme4</i> package) was imp along with ANOVA tests (<i>car</i> package) and pairwise p (<i>emmeans</i> package).

[•] Fixed effects for Korean data: Speaker Group (K-E bilinguals vs. Korean monolinguals), Stop Type (aspirated vs. lenis vs. fortis), Speaking Style (casual vs. clear)

May 8 – 12, 2023

inguistic influence in bilingual production of clear speech Ye-Jee Jung and Olga Dmitrieva

RESULTS

1.1 Korean clear speech: VOT

- Korean monolinguals Kor ŝ ŝ VOT VOT ns Casual Clear Style
 - (*** = p < .001; ** = p < 0.1; * = p < .05;
- Significant effects of Stop Type (aspirated = lenis and Speaking Style (clear > casual; $\chi 2$ (1) = 15.12
- The following interactions were significant: Speaking Style * Stop Type ($\chi 2$ (2) = 106.75, became greater in Korean clear speech in a
 - Increased VOT of aspirated and lenis st
 - Decreased VOT of fortis stops.
- Speaking Style * Stop Type * Speaker Group enhancement between stop types was more speech produced by K-E bilinguals.

1.2. Korean clear speech: Onset f0



- Significant effects of Stop Type (aspirated > fortis and Speaking Style (clear > casual; χ^2 (1) = 214.5 A Speaking Style by Stop Type interaction was signal
 - .001). Onset f0 of every stop type was increased
 - However, the degree of the increase was gr
 - than for lenis stops.
 - As a result, the onset f0 difference between was expanded in Korean clear speech.

-and language اد

- to cross-
- enhancing
- piced stops is voiceless stops
- pending on a
- nd VOT ech across

guage-specific

speak? istic influence? l in a Korean-like

- , age mean =
- , age mean =
- l, age mean =

initial alveolar

- in laryngeal 탄하다; n.t*an.ha.ta
- plation.
- speaking style.
- 2015)
- plemented in R, post-hoc tests
- inguals vs. ss), Speaking

Purdue University

	2.1 English clear speech
rean-English bilinguals	English monolin
***	100 - ***
Type Aspirated Lenis Fortis	(sm ui) ION 50
	Casual
	Style Significant effects of Stop
Style Style s ns = not significant)	 Speaking Style (clear > cas Speaker Group * Stop Typ (1) = 51.43, p < .001), and 51.43, p < .001) interactio
s > fortis; χ2 (2) = 239.74, p < .001) 2, p < .001).	 K-E bilinguals. The VOT difference v more pronounced in
, p < .001): The VOT distinction type-specific manner. tops.	2.2 English clear speech English monolin
o (χ2 (2) = 19.98, p < .001): The VOT re pronounced in Korean clear	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
***	-2 - Casual Style
Type Aspirated **** Lenis Fortis	 Significant effects of Stop Speaking Style (clear > cas A Speaker Group by Stop K-E bilinguals made English monolingual No other interactions were
Style is > lenis; $\chi 2$ (2) = 2139.26, p < .001) 56, p < .001). ignificant ($\chi 2$ (2) = 19.77) = 9,87, p < in Korean clear speech.	 Across the two languages often enhanced in a type e.g., Only VOT of "le Overall, bilingual clear sp and evidence of cross-lin Used onset f0 to en Used VOT enhances English monolingua
reater for aspirated and fortis stops	→ VOT plays a more pr Korean.
n iems and the other two stop types	We are grateful to Professor. Seok-C



2pSCa

RESULTS (CONT'D) ו: VOT Korean-English bilinguals nguals 125 -*** (su 75 Туре E. Voiced Voiceless -----Clear Casual Clear Style Type (voiceless > voiced; χ^2 (1) = 6040.74, p < .001) and sual; $\chi^2(1) = 51.43$, p < .001).

pe (χ2 (1) = 51.43, p < .001), Speaking Style * Stop Type (χ2 Speaking Style * Stop Type * Speaker Group ($\chi 2$ (1) = ons were all significant:

Is made a greater VOT distinction between stop types than

was enhanced in English clear speech, and this pattern was English monolinguals' clear speech.

n: Onset fO



Type (voiceless > voiced; $(\chi^2 (1) = 254.01, p < .001)$ and asual; $\chi^2(1) = 56.53$, p < .001).

Type interaction was significant ($\chi 2$ (1) = 224.44, p < .001): a greater onset f0 distinction between stop types than

re significant.

CUSSION & CONCLUSION

- s, VOT and onset FO differences between stop types were e-specific manner.
- long-lag" stops was lengthened in clear speech.
- peech demonstrated both language-specific characteristics nguistic influence.
- hance the contrast in Korean but not in English.
- ment more than Korean monolinguals but less than IS.
- prominent role in demarcating stop types in English than in

CKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chae Rhee at Yonsei University, Korea, for his help in collecting our data.

jung292/odmitrie@purdue.edu